

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of October 11, 1995 (approved)

revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM in the Jeannette Martin Room of Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the Minutes of September 13, 1995 \(revised\)](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. Report of the President/Provost (none)
4. [Report of the Bylaws Committee](#)
5. [Preliminary Report of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Retention Committee](#)
6. Charging the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee (postponed)
7. [Draft agenda for October 24, 1995 Senate meeting](#)
8. [Old Business](#)
9. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of September 13, 1995

Professor Welch requested additions or corrections to the minutes. Professor Bennett requested elaboration on the use of the term central on page 7, Item 6 which was discussed without incorporation into the minutes. Professor Jameson moved that the minutes be approved as distributed and Professor Schuel seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch reported that:

- The development of a data base of alumni with a group of top prospects for future donations to the University had been compiled by the Deans.

- The Provost had reflected the priorities of the SUNY System Administration to the Deans.
- Vice President for Advancement and Development Ronald Stein had presented information to the Deans regarding the capital campaign.
- The National Research Council (NRC) report had been a significant item for discussion at the meeting of the Deans.
- The President had expressed "deep concern" regarding the NRC report and commented on the opportunities for the faculty, the administration and SUNY System Administration to improve standings.
- The resolution regarding extension of the tenure clock had not yet been discussed by the appropriate parties.
- Professor Malone had been asked to summarize faculty responses to the "Rethinking SUNY" document across the state. He noted that responses had been primarily constructive criticism related to the structure of SUNY and differential tuition. Professor Malone commented on the importance of keeping the differential tuition on campus. The main subjects addressed by state-wide faculty were technology based instruction and distance learning. Distance learning, although useful, was not believed to be completely effective. Areas of concern with distance learning included a chilling effect on interpersonal interaction, few opportunities for questions and the forced use of multiple choice, machine graded testing.

Professor Malone commented that potential parents and students most commonly questioned the student- faculty ratio and the opportunities available for intimate interactions. He stated that the potential effect on enrollment had not been considered and that there were almost no data regarding the effectiveness of distance learning. The next most frequently raised issue in the state-wide responses was the "time-clock" mentality regarding increased teaching hours. Professor Malone stated that advising, lab instruction, small recitations, research, community service and study of a body of knowledge were factors to be considered in evaluating faculty responsibility. He mentioned the concept of remedial work being charged to the secondary schools. Other areas of concern reported were public safety and the

delivery of health counseling.

Professor Malone noted that SUNY Central had been renamed System Administration. He remarked that there was only one comment that there was too much administration at the local campus level. He stated that the document concentrated only on academic issues.

Professor Nickerson remarked that not as many insightful comments had been received regarding the structure of SUNY.

- The EPPC (Educational Programs and Policies Committee) would meet with Provost Headrick regarding the undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) issue.
- A report from the Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) would be included on the agenda for the October 24, 1995 Senate meeting.
- The Advisory Committee for the Reporter included Professor Jameson, Professor Holstun, Professor M. Zubrow and Professor Smith .
- Students had been appointed to several Faculty Senate committees, based on recommendations of students who had been involved in advanced leadership projects.
- Vice Provost Fischer was noted to be working on the transition of the function of the former Office of Teaching Effectiveness with the offices of the various deans. Professor Welch noted that an Ad Hoc teaching/learning committee was being formed and included Deans and recipients of the Chancellor's Awards and Distinguished Teaching Professorships. Specific members of the committee included Professors Ebert, Ludwig, W. Thomas, Herreid and Deans Goldberg, Grant, Petrie and Lopos.
- An Executive Session was scheduled for October 18, 1995 with the Provost and that the first Faculty Senate meeting was scheduled for October 24, 1995. There was no scheduled meeting of the FSEC on October 25, 1995.
- Vice President Stein and Vice Provost Triggles were scheduled to present at the FSEC meeting on November 1, 1995 on the capital campaign and graduate education respectively.

- The compendium of the Resolutions of the Faculty Senate had been distributed to the faculty and administration.
- The Facilities Planning Committee and the Computer Services Committee were meeting.

ITEM 4: Report of the Bylaws Committee

Professor Welch stated that the Bylaws Committee had been working diligently since 1992 on revisions to the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty and the Charter of the Faculty Senate. He announced that parliamentary procedure stated that the changes be considered as a unit based on the totality of the amendments. He commented on forwarding the amendments to the Senate with FSEC recommendations for consideration.

Professor Hopkins, Chair of the Faculty Senate Bylaws Committee, directed the FSEC to refer to the three documents which had been distributed prior to the meeting: 1) The Bylaws of the Voting Faculty, 2) the Charter of the Faculty Senate, and 3) a summary of proposed changes to both those documents.

Starting with the Bylaws, Professor Hopkins noted that while the proposals also included changes in terminology, organization of the document, and changes to reflect current realities, she would, in an effort to save time, concentrate on the changes of substance.

She started with Article I(m) on page 3 of the Bylaws where, in conformity with Article IX.B.1 of the 1994 Policies of the Board of Trustees (hereafter cited as "Policies"), it was proposed to replace the reference to the Chancellor with a reference to the President and to delete the phrase relating to consent.

In Article II.3(a) on page 4 the proposal was to insert the word "renaming" in the existing article which authorizes the Voting Faculty to review all proposals relating to various changes in academic units.

The new Article II.6, on p. 5, authorizes academic units of the University and the University Libraries to adopt, amend or repeal bylaws, standing orders and special orders for their own unit, consistent with the Bylaws of the Voting Faculty.

Two changes were proposed in Article III.1(c), on p.5; 1) an explicit inclusion of geographic full- time faculty as members of the Voting

Faculty, 2) and the removal of the provision excluding instructors enrolled in a degree program from membership in the Voting Faculty. The latter was justified on the basis of difficulty in identifying such persons and the small number involved in this category.

Changes in Article III.1(d), on p.6, included updating of the titles of some administrators and the addition of the Provost and Vice Provosts as members of the Voting Faculty.

Article III.2, on pp. 6-7, proposed that the elected officers of the Faculty Senate be allowed to serve two consecutive terms in the office to which they have been elected. There is currently a one-term limit. Professor Hopkins explained that the Bylaws Committee believed that there was a "strong learning curve" involved in the offices. Another change in Article III.2 was the provision for election of a new Chair should the office of Chair-Elect become vacant between election and taking of office as Chair on the following July 1. Since the vacancy would be for an entire term, it seemed wiser to hold a new election rather than have the Secretary assume office as Chair. Turning to vacancies in the office of Secretary, the wording was modified so as to be applicable whether the office of Secretary becomes vacant either permanently, as when the Secretary succeeds to the office of Chair, or temporarily, as when the Secretary serves as Acting Chair until an election can be held to fill the vacant office of Chair-Elect.

Article VI.3, on p.9, proposed reducing the quorum for a meeting of the Voting Faculty from 25% to 10% since it appeared that a 25% quorum would (assuming a faculty size of 1855 persons) require the attendance of 464 faculty members; an unrealistic expectation.

Article VII.5, on p.10, proposed that amendments to the Bylaws should require a two-thirds (rather than the current majority) affirmative vote of those members of the Voting Faculty who vote in the referendum. Various manuals of parliamentary practice tend to favor having a higher standard for such substantive matters than is required for ordinary business.

The final proposal was to add a new article (Article IX "Compatibility") on p. 12; this article indicated the position of the Bylaws in the hierarchy of governance documents.

Turning next to the Charter of the Faculty Senate, Professor Hopkins first commented briefly on changes that were being proposed to

reflect current conditions or practice: 1) Wording to make it clear that the Senate approves the appointment of faculty representatives to University-wide committees but does not make the appointments (Article II.2.B.(1)(b)(ii) on p. 2); 2) Addition of the Provost to the list of those to whom the Senate makes recommendations regarding graduate and professional programs (Article II.2.B.(2) on pp. 2-3); 3) Clarification that it is the FSEC, not the Senate, which appoints members to Senate committees (Article VI.3 on p. 11); 4) Recognition of the fact that the FSEC Chair may call special meetings of FSEC (Article VII.2.A on p.12); and 5) Recognition of the fact that proposals for amending the Charter may come from the Bylaws Committee, which is also given a role in reviewing all proposals for Charter amendment (Article VIII.1-2 on p. 13).

Professor Hopkins then concentrated on the changes of substance. She started with Article II.2.B (1) (b) (i) on p. 2 where the Bylaws Committee proposed changing a reference to "general education requirements" to "educational requirements" so as to remove any possible misunderstanding about whether the Senate's responsibility was limited to the so-called "general education" curriculum rather than to the entire undergraduate curriculum. Professor Welch clarified that other examples of Senate responsibilities include determinations regarding minimal grade point averages and credit hours required for graduation.

In Article II.2.C.(2) on page 3 the proposal was to insert the word "renaming" in the existing article which authorizes the Senate to review all proposals relating to various changes in academic units. Article III.1, on p. 3, included a proposal to expand the membership of the Senate to include Academic Deans, as non-voting members. The Bylaws Committee thought the increased involvement of the Deans would be beneficial for university governance.

Apportionment and re-apportionment of senators was covered in Article IV on pp. 4-5. Professor Hopkins explained that the "Institutional/General unit" (Article IV.1.C) was a catch-all unit to provide an electoral home for members of the Voting Faculty who did not fit either Article IV.1.A or IV.1.B. The Bylaws Committee had decided to base membership in this unit on the individual faculty member, not on administrative units so as to reduce the need for frequent changes in the future.

The Bylaws Committee had provided (in article IV.2) a procedure for

re-apportioning the Senate every five years or at the request of the FSEC. The Elections Committee was authorized to recalculate the size and composition of the Senate with the new electoral basis to take effect at the start of the next academic year.

Article IV.6, on p. 5, provided for Senatorial terms to start on July 1.

Article VI.1, on pp.7-9, relating to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, was reorganized into separate sections dealing with its Composition, Apportionment, Officers, Terms of office, and Duties. The Terms of office clause (VI.1.E on p. 8) included the provision also made in the Bylaws that the officers can serve two consecutive terms. The Duties clause (VI.1.F on pp. 8-9) spelled out what had hitherto been implicit.

Turning next to the Standing Committees of the Senate (Article VI.2 on pp. 9-11), Professor Hopkins explained that the Bylaws Committee proposed moving all the Standing Committees, except the Bylaws and Elections Committees, from the Charter to the Standing Orders of the Senate. She noted that the Standing Orders do not require Presidential approval and can be more easily updated than can the Charter.

Article VI.4, on p. 11, relating to the "Jurisdiction of Committees of the Senate", was completely reworded to provide that committees may review any topic within their charge, subject to the guidance of the Executive Committee.

Professor Hopkins asked for Senate advice on Article VIII "Amendments" on pp. 13-14. The current procedure for adopting amendments mentions two methods: 1) an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators voting in a meeting of the Senate and 2) an affirmative vote of the majority of those casting ballots in a referendum of the Voting Faculty. The existing version of the Charter does not say if those methods are to be used alternatively or in succession. The Bylaws Committee had decided to explore making the procedures alternatives. Doing so requires explicit criteria to determine which method should be used for each proposed Charter amendment. Without such criteria either both methods would have to be used successively or the second method would have to be deleted. The Bylaws Committee proposed the criteria set forth in new clauses 4-5 of Article VIII on p. 14.

Professor Hopkins concluded her review of the proposed Charter

changes by noting that Article IX "Effective Date and Transitional Rules" on pp. 14-15 was proposed for deletion as being no longer relevant.

Professor Adams, referring to the Bylaws, expressed concern with the concept of officers of the Senate being allowed to be elected to two successive two-year terms. On page 2 of the Charter, in Article II.2.B.(1)(b)(i) on the undergraduate curriculum, she noted that while one use of the word "general" was being proposed for removal, other uses of the word remained elsewhere in that same paragraph. She suggested that the remaining two uses of "general" also be removed. Professor Adams also questioned the number of GFT (geographic full-time faculty) involved in the last Senate election. It was noted that Personnel Services had supplied a list of 250 GFTs while the Deans had generated a list of 757 GFTs. Professor Hopkins stated that there were plans for the Elections Committee to reconcile the numbers.

Professor Jameson spoke on Article III.1.(c) of the Bylaws which currently provides that membership in the Voting Faculty includes full-time members of the academic staff having qualified academic rank and serving on appointments of more than one year. She thought it might be desirable to change that clause to allow inclusion in the Voting Faculty of those serving on one-year appointments. She noted that conditions exist which involve a succession of one-year appointments.

It was noted that the Director of Athletics had been included in the Voting Faculty (Article III.1.(d) of the Bylaws) and the suitability of that provision was questioned as well as where the Director would fit among the electoral units. Professor Welch responded by stating that the Director of Athletics and all those reporting to that individual would fit into the Institutional/ General unit.

Professor Horvath commented on the Institutional/General unit and the proposal to make the individual faculty member and not the administrative units the basis for membership. He also asked if the term "referendum" had been used in a restrictive or descriptive manner in Article VII.5 of the Bylaws. Professor Hopkins responded that the intent had been to use it descriptively. A discussion ensued regarding the meaning of those two words. "Restrictive" was conjectured to mean two-thirds of those members of the Voting Faculty who actually vote, while "descriptive" was speculated to

mean two-thirds of the entire Voting Faculty. Professor Malone noted that two-thirds of the total Voting Faculty (currently estimated to be 1855 persons) never voted in elections. Professor Hopkins noted that the wording was standard terminology and she took it to mean that the requirement was for an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the members of the Voting Faculty who actually voted, not of the entire Voting Faculty. Professor Adams suggested that a minimum threshold number should be required in a referendum. Professor Welch commented that it was hoped that the Bylaws and Charter revisions would be presented for a first reading at the Faculty Senate meeting on October 24, 1995.

Professor Horvath inquired into the GFT situation. Professor Hopkins replied that GFTs were included in the definition of "academic rank" in the 1994 Policies (Article II.(j) and in Article I.(i) of the Bylaws on (pp. 2-3. She noted that "burying" of this group in this definition had caused confusion in the past and that therefore the Bylaws Committee had decided to include that part of the definition relating to GFTs in the article specifying the membership of the Voting Faculty (Article III.1.(c) of the Bylaws). Professor Horvath questioned the Deans' authority to determine who had GFT status. Professor Hopkins noted that the Elections Committee was also concerned about GFTs. She stated that traditionally the list of Voting Faculty has been generated by Personnel Services. The list generated by Personnel had resulted in a number of GFTs not receiving ballots in the Spring 1995 election for Chair of the Faculty Senate. A temporary solution had been to ask the Deans for lists of their faculty with GFT status. There was a discrepancy between the number of names generated by the two different sources, with the Deans providing about 500 more names than Personnel. Professor Hopkins thought that the criteria sent to Personnel for the office to use in generating its list needed to be refined, in consultation with Personnel. Professor Welch reminded the FSEC that the Policies of the Board of Trustees could not be changed and that the Policies explicitly include GFTs as members of the Voting Faculty. Professor Horvath recommended defining the subset of all GFTs who are actually members of the Voting Faculty.

Provost Headrick commented on the enormous amount of careful work by the Bylaws Committee. He noted that the President shared in the pride of authorship and Professor Hopkins commented that

there were no proposals to change the Preface to the Bylaws which the President had written earlier in his career.

Professor Malone questioned if all GFTs participated in the Clinical Practice Plan and Professor Nickerson replied negatively. Professor Welch suggested that the definition of "medical center" was a pivotal issue. Professor Hare remarked that the definition of the GFTs was an important matter and he noted the provision that they be "available to the State on a full-time basis for clinical and instructional purposes, in accord with the Policies of the Board of Trustees." He commented on the "tricky" nature of the definition of GFTs and noted that he did not fully trust the Deans in their determination of who had GFT status. He recommended the formation of a first rate committee to interpret the meaning of the Policies of the Board of Trustees in relation to GFTs.

Professor Acara agreed with Professor Welch that the definition of the term "medical center" was important. She noted that the Schools of Nursing, Health Related Professions, Dentistry, Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy had been included in the lists generated by the Deans for the last election. She expressed doubt that 750 people would fulfill the criteria of serving at a medical center or its affiliated hospitals on an academic appointment of more than one year.

Professor Hadighi noted that there were faculty who serve on multiple one-year contracts. Professor Hopkins replied that those faculty with qualified rank who had one-year appointments did not qualify for membership in the Voting Faculty. Professor Welch reiterated that there were questions of interpretation related to the Policies of the Board of Trustees. Professor Wooldridge commented that although the definitions were not optimal, it appeared that the Policies could not be changed.

Vice Provost Goodman noted the omission of the Educational Programs and Policy Committee from the list of Standing Committees to be moved from the Charter to the Standing Orders. Professor commented that adding the word "all" to the undergraduate curriculum section of the Charter (Article II.2.B.(1) (b) (i)) as a replacement for the word "general" might be too inclusive. Professor Hopkins replied that it might be too inclusive but noted that the section in question applied to University-wide matters and not to requirements for specific departments or

Faculties.

Professor Horvath inquired if the Chair and Chair-Elect could be the same person and the answer was affirmative.

Professor Welch expressed a sense of gratitude to the Bylaws Committee. Professor Acara moved that the proposed changes in the Bylaws and the Charter be presented to the Faculty Senate on October 24, 1995; the motion was seconded by Professor Bennett and passed unanimously.

ITEM 5: Preliminary Report of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Retention Committee

Professor Welch referred to the resolution by Professor Jameson related to faculty recruitment and the proposal by the Director of Admissions regarding student athletes.

Professor Harwitz, Chair of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Retention Committee, stated that his committee had been unable to meet due to various members being out-of-town. He referred to the proposal by Mr. Durkin, Director of Admissions related to National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) initial eligibility standards effective Fall, 1996 requiring a minimum high school average in a specified core curriculum of 2.00 with an SAT 1 score of 900 or a 2.5 with an SAT 1 score of 700. The corresponding recentered SAT 1 scores were 1010 and 820. The systems presently employed in the Office of Admissions at the University at Buffalo would convert a 2.0 to an average of 77.9 and a 2.5 to an average of 83.4. The proposal was "that the Office of Admissions at the University at Buffalo implement, effective with Fall, 1996 admission offers, NCAA initial eligibility criteria as the minimum requirement for the admission of freshman student athletes." In support of this proposal the following statements were offered: 1. UB's current method of ranking freshman applicants would place a 77.9 average/1010 SAT 1 into the Individualized Admissions Programs (IAP) range. It would also place an 83.4 average/820 SAT 1 into that range. These average/score combinations have fallen within the IAP range in each of the last four admission cycles. 2. Establishing fixed criteria for the admission of student athletes would eliminate the misinformation that sometimes results from annual changes in acceptance standards for regular and IAP admission. 3. This approach places appropriate emphasis on preparation for University study as

measured by courses completed in determining the admissibility of a student athlete. The current emphasis is on performance as measured by grades, regardless of the rigor of courses selected. The core curriculum listed in the memorandum included four years of English, two years of Math (at least one year of Algebra and one year of Geometry), Natural and Physical Science (at least one lab course), Social Science and additional academic courses and one year of additional courses in English, Math or Science.

Professor Harwitz noted that the University has no core curriculum requirement for students applying from high school. As options for consideration, Professor Harwitz mentioned adding a core curriculum requirement to the admissions policy for all applicants and having an IAP criteria that varies with the applicant pool. He explained that current IAP policies offered admission to individuals who would experience great difficulty competing in the normal process. Professor Harwitz reported that the committee had been divided in responses to the options.

Professor Welch commented that there was a three pronged admissions policy including high school average, standard test scores and rank in class. He mentioned that 97% of New York State high school diplomas were in compliance with NCAA core curriculum requirements.

Professor Adams commented that she had been on the IAP Committee for the last two years and that the IAP had no absolute standards and that all aspects of individual cases were reviewed.

She noted that the IAP was not bound by particular SAT scores.

Professor Jameson requested an explanation regarding the core curriculum. Professor Harwitz stated that a New York State high school diploma might meet the criteria.

Professor Welch stated that the issue could be checked. Professor Malone commented that there was no choice regarding adoption of the NCAA rules.

Professor Bennett stated that he was a member of the IAP Committee and he agreed with Professor Adams regarding the necessity for flexibility. He stated that IAP admissions should not be tied in with the NCAA criteria.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that discussion was needed regarding a core curriculum. He noted that the New York State Regents curriculum appeared to include the required core. He remarked that

numerous students received local diplomas and therefore might not meet the core curriculum requirement. He noted that the high school Math curriculum was sequential Math and not one year of Algebra and one year of Geometry. Vice Provost Goodman questioned whether it was possible to be in compliance.

Professor Wooldridge concurred that core course requirements should not be imposed on IAP admissions unless also imposed on other athletic admissions. He also suggested that the proviso to permit athletic IAP admissions to students not meeting University grade and SAT standards might be desirable.

Professor Welch stated that it did not appear that the topic should be placed on the Faculty Senate agenda at this time due to the need for further discussion.

Professor Malone commented that athletes admitted under the IAP had done well if not better than students admitted under general requirements.

Professor Horvath requested discussion of the fourth criterion of rigor. He stated that the issue was broader than IAP and that the Office of Admissions needed to figure out the meaning of rigor. He expressed concern regarding usurping of Senate powers.

Professor Welch commented that the Senate criteria were quantitative rather than qualitative. He noted that high schools differed in grading and that at a selective high school, a 78 could be the median average of students of above average quality. He stated that students could have a poor rank and average but above average SAT scores.

Professor Horvath stated that he was in favor of rigor and a core curriculum but was opposed to the Senate losing its authority in establishing the criteria for admissions.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that the admission criteria were twenty years old and were excessively mechanical. He remarked that the Office of Admissions needed direction for increased sophistication in the admission process. He mentioned that the teleconference on academic integrity asked students to write an essay. He noted that essays were not part of the admissions criteria and that he believed that this was an important ability to review in the process.

Professor Jameson agreed with Professor Horvath that inclusion of rigor was appropriate and she expressed the hope that Mr. Durkin

would be receptive to the experience of the faculty.

Professor Malone echoed the remarks of Vice Provost Goodman and expanded to state that rank in class was no longer reported and that the average was converted and included twice. He questioned what correlated with success.

Professor Wooldridge suggested that the formula used to estimate high school rank when that is not available, include the SAT score as well as high school grade point average.

Professor Hadighi supported Vice Provost Goodman's comment to bring admissions criteria up-to-date.

Professor Harwitz suggested studying the literature on usable predictors. He stated that if rigor was a predictor, it would be appropriate to include in admissions criteria. He questioned the cost of reading student essays and stated that the Office of Admissions was not equipped for this purpose.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that there was general agreement that the University would need to improve recruitment to survive financially through tuition generated revenue. He noted that recruitment of better students would yield successful outcomes. He remarked that admissions should be handled carefully in line with budgetary allocations.

ITEM 7: Draft Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting of October 24, 1995

Professor Welch suggested removing Item 7, the first reading of the draft resolutions on faculty role in student recruitment and the NCAA standards for admission of student athletes. Professor Jameson suggested moving the proposal regarding faculty role in student recruitment. Professor Welch replied that if possible the resolution could be brought to the meeting. He suggested adding the resolution by Professor Adams thanking Professor Nickerson to the agenda.

Professor Nickerson recommended that Professor Welch reorder the agenda and place the Report of the Chair prior to the Report of the President/Provost to establish the importance of the Senate.

Professor Bennett moved to approve the agenda as modified and Professor Acara seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

ITEM 8: Old Business

Professor Nickerson, as a member of the Graduate School Executive Committee, reported that the Provost had attended the last meeting and discussed the future of graduate education. He noted that the appointment of a new Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School provided an opportunity to identify problems and solutions to graduate education. Professor Nickerson urged that maintenance of the quality of the enterprise was crucial especially while the concept of research institutions was under attack.

The need to further investigate the issue of gft faculty was noted.

ITEM 9: New Business

Professor Welch, referring to a memorandum from Dr. Moore, Vice President for Public Service and Urban Affairs, stated that the Center for Applied Public Affairs Studies was being recommended for re-assignment to the School of Architecture and Planning. He noted that it was also being recommended that the name of the Center be changed from the Center for Applied Public Affairs Studies to the Center for Urban Studies.

Professor Adams inquired if the re-assignment was appropriate. Professor Welch commented on the economic problems of the City of Buffalo. He noted the importance of economic development for minorities. Professor Malone stated that the Center was an academic, degree awarding program and that it was sensible to report to an academic dean. He noted that the Center differed from Millard Fillmore College which was not an academic unit.

Professor Horvath questioned whether faculty within the unit had concerns regarding tenure and promotion. Professor Welch replied that they were currently ineligible for tenure based on the current administrative assignment.

Professor Hadighi stated that the activities of the Center including planning, housing and design proposals were directly related to the School of Architecture and Planning and therefore highly appropriate.

Professor Albini asked if the faculty were in agreement with the reassignment and Professor Welch responded affirmatively.

Professor Nickerson recommended receiving and filing the document. Professor Malone recommended taking cognizance.

Professor Adams stated that the name and reporting relationship

proposal should be reviewed by the FSEC and a recommendation made by the FSEC. Professor Welch stated that it was important to have a formal FSEC action on the record. Professor Malone moved that the FSEC receive and endorse the reassignment of the Center for Applied Public Affairs Studies to the School of Architecture and Planning with the new name of the Center for Urban Studies. The motion was seconded by Professor Albini and was passed.

Professor Nickerson stated that there was a new FSA director, Mr. J. Craig Herman. He mentioned new ideas including catering and meal plan options. He noted that input was welcome and that this was an opportunity for change.

Professor Horvath remarked that the new SUNY cards presented inconsistencies in relationship to the person numbers. Ms Cornwall stated that there was a discrepancy between the last eight digits of the SUNY card and the former student number.

It was noted that fsec-l information was sent via e-mail only to FSEC members.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Faculty Senate Secretary

Those present:

University Officers: N. Goodman

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: M. Hadighi

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Law: E. Meidinger

Management: R. Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albini, H. Schuel
Nursing: P. Wooldridge
Pharmacy: N.
Social Sciences: P. Hare
SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson
University Libraries: J. Adams

GUESTS:

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall
Reporter: S. Cox
Other Guests: M. Harwitz, J. Hopkins, M. Kramer